

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 18 and 21 - 31 remain pending in the case.

Claims 1 - 5, 7 - 11, 13, 15 - 18, 21 - 22 and 27 - 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,015,416 issued to Stefanchik et al. Further, claims 6, 12 and 23 - 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefanchik et al. ('416) in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,947,983 issued to Solar et al. The Examiner states, on Pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action that Stefanchik et al. ('416) discloses that the two guidetracks intersect at least one of the beginning and at the end of their course along the recess, intertwine each other or extend directly adjacent to each other. Further, the Examiner states on Page 6, Item 8, that the Applicant's argument filed on January 29, 2004 have been fully considered. However, a Supplemental Response was faxed on February 4, 2004 and forwarded to the Examiner on February 10, 2004 (according to the United States Patent and Trademark Office PAIR system). It does not appear that the Examiner fully considered the claims and arguments of the Supplemental Response of February 4, 2004, since claim 1 was amended to eliminate the phrases "intertwine in each other or extend directly adjacent to each other." As a result, the last paragraph of claim 1 read "wherein the two guidetracks intersect at least one of the beginning and at the end of their course along the recess." Stefanchik does not show or disclose the guidetracks intersecting" In Figure 14, the guidetracks are completely parallel and adjacent. Because the Examiner has not fully considered the responses of the Applicant, the Final Rejection should be withdrawn. The Applicant's attorney attempted to contact both the Examiner, Jessica Baxter, and the Examiner's supervisor, Michael Milano, on July 15 and 16, 2004 and was unsuccessful. The Applicant's attorney did not receive a return call from the Examiner or her supervisor until late in the afternoon of July 16, 2004. In the conversation, the Examiner indicated that she did not have time to look at the case before a response to the Office Action dated April 16, 2004 was due. For the aforementioned reasons, a withdrawal of the Final Rejection is respectfully requested.

However, to clarify the intent of the meaning of claim 1, claim 1 has been amended to place in better idiomatic English and thereby require that the two guidetracks intersect each other at least at one of the beginning and at the end of their course. This Amendment is based on the claims in the Supplemental Amendment dated February 4, 2004. This Amendment to claim 1 does not raise new issues or new matter that would require further consideration and/or search if the Examiner had prosecuted the correct Amendment. Further any previous search done for original claim 20 which claimed the guidetracks intertwining (which means: to join by twining together) would have encompassed any prior art where the guidetracks intersect since an intertwine requires at least one crossing over or intersection of the guidetracks.

If the Examiner feels that prosecution of the present application can be expedited by way of an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & BASILE, P.C.



Darlene P. Condra
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37113
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107

Dated: July 16, 2004
DPC/dge